



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/067,108	02/04/2002	Jurgen Kemkes	3648.031	5996

7590 12/18/2003

STEPHAN A. PENDORF
PENDORF & CUTLIFF
5111 MEMORIAL HIGHWAY
TAMPA, FL 33634-7356

EXAMINER

PIAZZA CORCORAN, GLADYS JOSEFINA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1733

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

db7

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/067,108

Applicant(s)

KEMKES, JURGEN

Examiner

Gladys J Piazza Corcoran

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The limitations recited in claim 10 of "the sealing is carried out with a varnish applied at a preselected thickness for producing a desired gloss" should be recited in the Specification, without adding new matter to the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 1 is unclear by reciting, "and fixing the paper copy." It is unclear what the paper copy is fixed to. It is suggested to amend to --and fixing the paper copy to the matrix.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the laminated matrix" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend line 8 to recite --of the paper copy to form a laminate--, and line 9 to recite --pressing the laminate and the matrix at least once--.

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the laminate" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend line 8 to recite --of the paper copy to form a laminate--.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the resulting structured laminate" in line 10. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend line 9 to recite --at least once to form a structured laminate--.

8. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the original painting" in lines 2 and 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend line 2 to recite --an original painting--

9. Claim 7 is unclear by reciting "an adhesion surface between paper copy and canvas." It is suggested to amend to -- an adhesion surface between the paper copy and the canvas--.

10. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the laminate" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is suggested to amend claim 1, line 8 to recite --of the paper copy to form a laminate--.

11. Claim 9 is unclear by reciting "and canvas is after the pressing mounted under tensioned." It is suggested to amend to -- and canvas is, after the pressing, mounted under tension--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1733

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falk (US Patent No. 3,964,946) in view of Lang et al. '063 (US Patent No. 5,182,063) and Baratto (US Patent No. 5,721,041).

Falk discloses a process for producing a three-dimensional surface structure in a paper copy of a picture, the paper copy in the form of a paper poster or photograph with an image side (image bearing sheet) by adhering canvas onto the back surface of the paper copy (column 2, lines 23-50), and then pressing the image side of the paper copy with an embossing roller to form the three-dimensional surface structure (column 2, lines 58-60) and then sealing the structured laminate (column 3, lines 24-30).

Lang '063 discloses it is known in the art to produce reproductions with a textured surface by embossing in a press with a matrix in order to provide a reproduction of the textured surface of the original on the reproduction. Lang '063 shows placing the paper copy (embossing material 256) with the image side down onto a matrix (die 240) having a surface structure, the paper copy being equal in size to or smaller than the matrix, cold surface pressing the laminated matrix at least once, removing the resulting structured product after the pressing from the matrix (column 12, lines 1-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to produce the reproduction as shown in Falk by embossing the laminate of the paper copy and the canvas in a press with a matrix as shown by Lang '063 in order to reproduce the surface texture of the original painting onto the reproduction.

As to the limitation of fixing the paper copy, as set forth above this limitation is unclear. However from the Specification, it appears as though this limitation is meant to mean that the paper copy is fixed to the matrix. The reference Baratto is cited to show it is well known in the art when embossing reproductions with a matrix, the reproduction is fixed to the matrix (column 7, lines 11-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Flak by fixing the paper copy to the matrix when embossing in order to properly hold the paper copy in place during embossing as is well known in the art and exemplified by .

As to the limitation of mounting the laminate under tension onto a frame, Baratto discloses an example of how it is well known in the art to mount reproductions under tension onto frames (column 1, lines 30-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk by mounting the laminate under tension onto a frame as it is well known in the art in order to display the reproduction as exemplified by Baratto.

As to claim 2, the matrix in Lang '063 is an imprint of an original painting and the image is a copy of the painting. As to claim 3, the matrix in Lang '063 has a canvas textured surface structure (column 3, lines 15-16). As to claim 5, the reference Lang '063 discloses a pressure of 1 ton/in² for pressing one layer of paper. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill art to select the appropriate pressure for embossing a laminate as the one shown in Falk, such determination is dependent only upon the materials used and the depth of the texture of the matrix desired to be imparted on the laminate.

As to claim 7, Baratto shows it is known in the art to provide a reinforcing layer of paper between the image and the substrate in laminates for forming reproductions (column 8, lines 15-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk by providing a paper covering between the canvas and the paper copy in order to form a reinforcing layer as shown by Baratto.

As to claim 8, Falk discloses using any suitable adhesive. It is unclear whether the example adhesive disclosed in Falk is water soluble. Baratto shows it is known in the art to adhere images to substrates using water soluble adhesive in particular in order to form flexibility to the finished reproduction (column 4, lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk with a water soluble adhesive as is well known in the art and exemplified by Baratto in order to form a more flexible reproduction.

As to claim 10, Falk discloses sealing the reproduction but does not specifically disclose applying a varnish at a preselected thickness for producing a desired gloss. It is well known in the art when sealing paintings in particular reproductions to apply a varnish at a preselected thickness for producing a desired gloss. For example see the disclosure in Baratto (column 7, line 66 to column 8, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sealing layer in Falk by applying a varnish at a preselected thickness for producing a desired gloss as is well known in the art and exemplified by Baratto in order to form a desired glossy finish.

Art Unit: 1733

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falk in view of Lang et al. '063 and Baratto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Giorgi (US Patent No. 3,856,592), Lang '734 (US Patent No. 4,971,743) and/or Barnett (US Patent No. 154,576).

It is well known in the art to provide an elastic mate between a press and the materials being pressed in order to provide an evenly distributed pressing force to the materials and to prevent the materials from tearing. Giorgi, Lang '743, and/or Barnett all disclose examples in the art of providing elastic mats in order to protect materials during embossing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk, Lang et al. '063, and Baratto by providing an elastic mate between the press and the canvas in order to protect the laminate as is well known in the art and further exemplified by Giorgi, Lang '743, and/or Barnett.

15. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falk in view of Lang et al. '063 and Baratto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Robinson (US Patent No. 3,880,686).

The matrix in Lang '063 is formed of a metal. Robinson discloses forming a matrix for embossing textures of original paintings out of a synthetic resin (silicone rubber) in order to avoid the costs of forming out of metal (column 1, lines 58-68; column 3, lines 34-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk, Lang et al. '063, and

Baratto with a matrix formed of synthetic resin as is known in the art and shown by Robinson in order to avoid the expense of forming a metal die.

16. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falk in view of Lang et al. '063 and Baratto as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hulbert (US Patent No. 615,026).


As discussed above, it is known to mount reproductions under tension onto a frame after forming in order to be displayed as shown by Baratto. Whether or not the laminate in Falk is still damp from the water soluble adhesive is only dependent upon the amount of drying the laminate is exposed to prior to mounting. It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to mount the laminate while still damp from the adhesive particularly in view of the disclosure in Baratto that the adhesive allows flexibility to the laminate to reduce cracking. Furthermore, Hulbert shows an example of embossing a laminate image and support where the laminate is left in the press any desired length of time until sufficiently dried (page 2, lines 65-66). Therefore, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to remove the laminate and mount on the frame prior to completely drying, only the expected results would be attained. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form the reproduction as shown in Falk, Lang et al. '063 and Baratto by mounting the laminate while still damp from the adhesive as is considered within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art in light of the disclosures by Baratto and Hulbert, only the expected results would be attained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gladys J Piazza Corcoran whose telephone number is (703) 305-1271 until December 18, 2003 and (571) 272-1214 afterwards. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (703) 308-3853. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


Gladys J Piazza Corcoran
Examiner
Art Unit 1733

GJPC